arXiv:astro-ph/0403213v2 28 Apr 2004

Curvaton scenario with low scale inflation revisited

Marieke Postma

The Abdus Salam ICTP, Strada Costiera 11, Trieste, Italy

Abstract

In its simplest form the curvaton paradigm requires the Hubble parameter during inflation to be bigger than $10^8\,\mathrm{GeV}$, but this bound may be evaded in non-standard settings. In the heavy curvaton scenario the curvaton mass increases significantly after the end of inflation. We reanalyze the bound in this set up, taking into account the upper bound on the curvaton mass from direct decay. We obtain $H_* > 10^8\,\mathrm{GeV}$ if the mass increase occurs at the end of inflation, and $H_* > 10^{-14}\,\mathrm{GeV}$ if it occurs just before nucleosynthesis. We then discuss two implementations of the heavy curvaton. Parameters are constrained in these explicit models, and as a result even obtaining TeV scale inflation is hard to obtain.

1 Introduction

In the curvaton scenario not the inflaton but some other light field — the curvaton field — is responsible for the observed density perturbations [1]. In the post inflationary epoch the curvaton oscillates around the origin of its potential in a radiation dominated background. It is during this period that the curvaton contribution to the total energy density grows and the isocurvature perturbations of the curvaton field are converted into adiabatic ones. The resulting perturbation spectrum is Gaussian if the curvaton accounts for at least one percent of the total energy density at the time of decay.

The great merit of the curvaton scenario is that it liberates models of inflation [2]. Both the scale of inflation, and the flatness of the inflaton potential are decoupled from the observed magnitude and scale dependence of the cosmic microwave background (CMB) spectrum. This means in particular that inflation can take place at a much lower scale than the customary $H_* \sim 10^{10} - 10^{14}\,\mathrm{GeV}$.

Many models of inflation have been constructed, in which the inflaton potential is generated by the same supersymmetry (SUSY) breaking mechanism that operates in the vacuum, and the scale of inflation is naturally $H_* \sim 10^3\,\mathrm{GeV}$ [3, 4, 5]. However, as was shown in Ref. [6] the curvaton scenario in its simplest form cannot accommodate such low inflationary scales either. The reason is that the lower the scale of inflation, the lower is the initial curvaton energy density and the shorter the period of oscillations. Only for large enough Hubble constants during inflation, $H_* > 10^7\,\mathrm{GeV}$, can the curvaton come to dominate the energy density (and decay) before the epoch of nucleosynthesis.

To rescue low scale models of inflation it is necessary to go beyond the simplest curvaton scenario. [1] One way to reconcile low scale inflation with the curvaton scenario is to consider curvaton oscillations in a background dominated by a stiff fluid instead of radiation [8]. In Refs. [6, 9] the "heavy curvaton" scenario was proposed, in which the curvaton mass increases significantly after the end of inflation. In this paper we reanalyze the bound on the Hubble constant during inflation within this scenario. As the curvaton mass increases so does its decay rate. This leads to an upper bound on the curvaton mass at the time of curvaton decay; increasing the mass beyond this bound will lead to a rapid decay of the curvaton condensate. This constraint was not taken into account in previous works. We obtain the bound on the inflationary scale in the heavy curvaton scenario $H_* > 10^8\,\mathrm{GeV}$ if the mass increase occurs right after the end of inflation, and $H_* > 10^{-14}\,\mathrm{GeV}$ if it occurs just before big bang nucleosynthesis (BBN).

In the next section we start with a review of the bound on the Hubble scale during inflation in the simplest curvaton scenario. How this bound can be evaded is discussed in turn in section 3. In particular, the heavy curvaton scenario is detailed. The rest of the paper is devoted to two specific implementations of the heavy curvaton. In section 4 we discuss a model in which the curvaton mass increases due to a direct coupling to a “Higgs” field. In section 5 we analyze a scenario in which the curvaton is an axion. Its mass receives contributions from two different non-renormalizable operators; one operator dominates during inflation, whereas the other dominates afterwards. Although theoretically an inflationary scale as low as $H_* \sim 10^{-14}\,\text{GeV}$ is possible, we find that in these explicit models even low scale inflation with $H_* \sim$ TeV is hard to obtain. The reason is that once an explicit model is specified, there are relations between the various parameters, which can no longer be varied independently.

---

[1] See Ref. [7] for a discussion of low scale inflation in the context of the inhomogeneous reheating scenario.

2 The bound on the inflationary scale

We define the curvaton density parameter $\Omega_\sigma \equiv \rho_\sigma/\rho_{\text{tot}}$, which gives the contribution of the curvaton to the total energy density. The curvaton density parameter changes with time; at the onset of curvaton oscillations

$$\Omega_{\text{osc}} = \frac{m_\sigma^2 \sigma_*^2}{H_{\text{osc}}^2 M_{\text{pl}}^2}, \tag{1}$$

with m_σ the curvaton mass. The subscripts ’osc’ and ’*’ denote the corresponding quantity at the onset of curvaton oscillations, and during inflation at the time observable scales leave the horizon, respectively. We have dropped the subscript σ from the curvaton density parameter to avoid notational cluttering. If the curvaton and the background energy density red shift at different rates, the curvaton contribution to the total energy density changes, according to

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\Omega_\sigma}{\Omega_\sigma} = -\alpha(H)\frac{\mathrm{d}H}{H}, \tag{2}$$

with

$$\alpha(H) = \frac{2(\omega_{\text{tot}} - \omega_\sigma)}{1 + \omega_{\text{tot}}}. \tag{3}$$

Here $\omega_{\text{tot}} = (\Sigma_i \omega_i \rho_i)/\rho_{\text{tot}}$ with $p_i = \omega_i \rho_i$ the equation of state for each fluid. The quantity $\alpha(H)$ changes if either the equation of state parameter of the background or that of the curvaton changes. In particular, when the curvaton energy density comes to dominate the total energy density, $\omega_{\text{tot}} \to \omega_\sigma$, the back ground and curvaton red shift at the same rate and $\alpha(H) \to 0$. The ratio Ω_σ remains less than unity as it should be.

Consider the simple case that α remains constant after the onset of curvaton oscillations until the curvaton energy density approaches the total energy density. The generalization to a changing α, which occurs for example if the inflaton field decays after the onset of oscillations, is straightforward; we will comment on it later. Denote by α the constant value of $\alpha(H)$ when $\rho_\sigma \ll \rho_{\text{tot}}$. Since $\alpha(H)$ vanishes in the limit that the curvaton comes to dominate the energy density we can write down the inequality: [2]

$$\Omega_{\rm dec} \lesssim \frac{m_\sigma^2 \sigma_*^2}{H_{\rm osc}^2 M_{\rm pl}^2} \left(\frac{H_{\rm osc}}{\Gamma_\sigma}\right)^\alpha, \tag{4}$$

with Γ_σ the curvaton decay rate, and $\Omega_{\rm dec}$ the curvaton density parameter at the time of curvaton decay. The observed spectrum of density perturbations is obtained for [10, 11]

$$\sigma_* \approx \Omega_{\rm dec} q A^{-1} H_*, \tag{5}$$

with $A = 1.5\pi \times 10^{-4}$. The damping factor q is defined through $(\delta\sigma/\sigma)_{\rm dec} = q(\delta\sigma/\sigma)_*$. For a quadratic or flat potential $q = 1$, but it is different for other monomials. Combining Eqs. (4, 5) leads to the bound on the Hubble constant during inflation:

$$H_* \gtrsim \frac{H_{\rm osc} M_{\rm pl} A}{m_\sigma q \Omega_{\rm dec}^{1/2}} \left(\frac{\Gamma_\sigma}{H_{\rm osc}}\right)^{\alpha/2}. \tag{6}$$

The minimum value for the decay rate is $\Gamma_\sigma > \max[\Gamma_{\rm grav}, \Gamma_{\rm bbn}]$, with $\Gamma_{\rm grav} \sim m_\sigma^3/M_{\rm pl}^2$ the decay rate for gravitational decay, and $\Gamma_{\rm bbn} \sim 4\times10^{-25}$ GeV corresponds to decay just before BBN.

The bound on H_* is minimized in the limit that the curvaton decays just when it comes to dominate the energy density. The period of curvaton oscillations has to be sufficiently long for domination to be possible. Since for a lower scale of inflation the initial curvaton vacuum expectation value (VEV) is smaller, see Eq. (5), this period becomes increasingly long in this limit. It might seem that the period of curvaton oscillations can be shortened, and therefore the bound be lowered, if the curvaton decays when it is still sub-dominant in energy and $\Omega_{\rm dec} < 1$. However, this advantage is more than off set by the fact that to obtain the right size of density perturbations the initial curvaton VEV is lower, and therefore $\Omega_{\rm osc}$ is lower. As a result the bound is actually stronger by a factor $\Omega_{\rm dec}^{-1/2}$.

A Gaussian perturbation spectrum, in agreement with observations, requires $\Omega_{\rm dec} > 10^{-2}$, that is, the curvaton has to account for at least one percent of the total energy density at the time of decay [10].

2.1 Standard scenario

In the simplest models the curvaton field remains frozen until $H \sim m_\sigma$, at which point the field starts oscillating in the potential well. The curvaton potential is quadratic and $q \sim 1$. After inflaton decay the background is radiation dominated and $\alpha = 1/2$. We will refer to these parameter values as the standard scenario. The bound in Eq. (6) then becomes

---

[2] If Γ_σ is much smaller than $H_{\rm dom}$, the Hubble constant at which the curvaton comes to dominate the energy density, this equality is satisfied by many orders of magnitude. As a consequence the Hubble bound in Eq. (6) is off (to weak) by an amount $(\Gamma_\sigma/H_{\rm dom})^{\alpha/2}$. We will come back to this issue when discussing the heavy curvaton.

$$H_* \gtrsim A M_{\rm pl} \lambda^{1/2}. \tag{7}$$

Here $\Gamma_\sigma \sim \lambda^2 m_\sigma$ and $\lambda \geq \max[\lambda_{\rm bbn},\, \lambda_{\rm grav}]$, with

$$\lambda_{\rm bbn} \sim \sqrt{H_{\rm bbn}/m_\sigma}, \tag{8}$$

$$\lambda_{\rm grav} \sim m_\sigma/M_{\rm pl}, \tag{9}$$

the coupling corresponding to decay just before BBN, and a gravitational strength coupling respectively. Plugging in the minimum value for the coupling gives

$$H_* > \max\left[10^7\,{\rm GeV}\left(\frac{H_*}{m_\sigma}\right)^{1/5},\, 5\times 10^{11}\,{\rm GeV}\left(\frac{m_\sigma}{H_*}\right)\right] \tag{10}$$

The first bound in Eq. (10) is stronger for $\lambda_{\rm bbn} > \lambda_{\rm grav}$ or $m_\sigma < m_{\rm cr}(H_{\rm bbn}) \sim 10^4\,{\rm GeV}$, whereas in the opposite limit the second bound applies. Here $m_{\rm cr}(\Gamma_\sigma)$ is the mass for which the decay rate becomes of gravitational strength:

$$m_{\rm cr}(\Gamma_\sigma) = (\Gamma_\sigma M_{\rm pl}^2)^{1/3}. \tag{11}$$

The bound is minimized by minimizing the coupling. For $\lambda = \lambda_{\rm bbn}$ this means increasing the mass to its largest possible value; for $\lambda = \lambda_{\rm grav}$ it means decreasing the curvaton mass as much as possible. Hence, the bound is weakest in the limit $m_\sigma \to m_{\rm cr}(H_{\rm bbn})$ for which $\Gamma_{\rm grav} \to \Gamma_{\rm bbn}$. The absolute lower bound then is

$$H_* > 8\times 10^7\,{\rm GeV}. \tag{12}$$

This result is clearly incompatible with low scale inflation with $H_* \sim$ TeV.

The lower bound is obtained in the limit $\Omega_{\rm dec} \to 1$, when Eq. (4) is saturated. It is assumed that inflaton decay happens before the onset of curvaton oscillations, $\Gamma_I \gtrsim H_{\rm osc}$, with I denoting the inflaton field. Otherwise the lower bound is increased by a factor $(m_\sigma/\Gamma_I)^{1/4}$.

3 Evading the bound

To evade, or at least, to weaken the above bound on the Hubble constant during inflation, one can try one or several of the following possibilities:

- $q > 1$
- $\alpha > 1/2$
- $H_{\rm osc}/m_\sigma < 1$

A damping factor $q > 1$ is possible with a potential that grows faster than quadratic at large VEV [12]. Nevertheless, the bound will be stronger as the combination $\sigma_* \propto \Omega_\sigma q$ always decreases faster than for a quadratic potential. Another possibility is that the potential increases slower than quadratic. However, small sub-horizon scale fluctuations will grow at a much faster rate than the super-horizon scale fluctuations observed by CMB experiments. The condensate will fragment or decay into Q-balls when $H \sim m_\sigma$ [13]. Q-balls behave as non-relativistic matter, and the curvaton bound is not much different from the standard case.

It is possible to have $\alpha > 1/2$ if the background is dominated by a fluid that red shifts faster than radiation and $\omega_{\rm tot} > 1/3$. If the inflaton energy density is dominated by kinetic energy the inflaton behaves as a stiff fluid and $\omega_{\rm tot} = 1$, giving an explicit realization.

If the effective curvaton mass increases after the end of inflation it is possible to have $H_{\rm osc}/m_\sigma < 1$. Such a mass change could be triggered by a phase transition — a Higgs mechanism comes to mind. Thermal masses are no good for this purpose, as early thermal evaporation should be avoided.

3.1 Stiff inflaton fluid

The bound in Eq. (6) is weakened by increasing the exponent $\alpha > 1/2$. The maximum value, $\alpha = 1$, is obtained for a stiff fluid with $\omega = 1$. This is exactly what happens if inflation is followed by a period of kination, which occurs for example in quintessential inflation [14, 15] and disformal inflation [5]. The bound for a background dominated by a stiff fluid is

$$H_* > M_{\rm pl} A \lambda. \tag{13}$$

Plugging in the minimal coupling gives

$$H_* > \max\left[10^2\,{\rm GeV}\left(\frac{H_*}{m_\sigma}\right)^{1/3},\ 5\times10^{-4} m_\sigma\right]. \tag{14}$$

For $m_\sigma < m_{\rm cr}(H_{\rm bbn}) \sim 10^4\,{\rm GeV}$ (see Eq. (11)) the first bound is stronger, whereas in the opposite limit the second expression prevails. A scale invariant spectrum is obtained for $H_* > 10 m_\sigma$, which is actually a stronger bound for gravitational decay. The absolute lower bound on the scale of inflation then is

$$H_* > 10^2\,{\rm GeV}. \tag{15}$$

This is compatible with low scale inflation, though not very comfortably.

In Ref. [8] the bound on the Hubble scale for gravitational decay — the second bound on the right hand side of Eq. (3.1) — was derived. However, Ref. [8] then proceeds by taking $m \to m_{\rm cr}(H_{\rm bbn}) \sim$ TeV to obtain the lower bound $H_* >$ GeV, forgetting that $m \gg H_*$ is incompattible with a scale invariant perturbation spectrum.

It is assumed that inflaton decay happens after the curvaton comes to dominate the energy density. Otherwise, if the inflaton decays into radiation, $\alpha \to 1/2$ as in the standard scenario and the bound gets stronger by a factor $(\Gamma_I/\Gamma_\sigma)^{1/4}$. For TeV scale inflaton masses and gravitational strength couplings inflaton decay happens at $\Gamma_I \sim 10^{-4} H_{\rm bbn}$. This poses no problem as long as the inflaton energy density is small enough at the time of decay, so that the accompanying entropy production is small; in this scenario the universe is reheated by curvaton decay. Low scale inflation with $H_* \sim$ TeV requires $\Gamma_\sigma/H_{\rm bbn} \lesssim 10^2$. This constitutes tuning.

3.2 Heavy curvaton

In the heavy curvaton scenario the curvaton mass increases significantly during a phase transition, at $H = H_{\rm pt}$, from $(m_\sigma)_* \to m_\sigma \gg (m_\sigma)_*$ with $(m_\sigma)_*$ the curvaton mass during inflation. If the curvaton mass after the phase transition is smaller than the Hubble constant $m_\sigma < H_{\rm PT}$, oscillations set in when $H_{\rm osc} \sim m_\sigma$ and the bound of the standard scenario applies, with the sole difference that now the mass can be larger than the Hubble scale during inflation (but $(m_\sigma)_* < H_*$ to assure a scale invariant spectrum).

The more interesting case occurs in the opposite limit, $m_\sigma > H_{\rm pt}$, when oscillations set in at the time of the phase transition and the ratio $H_{\rm osc}/m_\sigma$ is less than unity. This may weaken the bound on the inflationary scale Eq. (6) with respect to the standard scenario. This possibility was discussed in Refs. [6, 9]. However, these papers did not take into account the accompanying increase in the decay rate, and the constraints this puts on the scenario.

3.2.1 Mass increase at the end of inflation: $H_{\rm pt} \sim H_*$

We consider first the case that the curvaton mass increases right after the end of inflation. The advantage of such a scenario is that the phase transition triggering the mass increase can be be part of the inflaton sector, and hence no new dynamics need to be introduced. This would be realized for example if the curvaton field is coupled to the waterfall field in hybrid inflation.

As the curvaton mass increases so does the curvaton decay rate. As follows from Eq. (6), a larger mass can lower the bound on H_*, whereas a larger decay rate is counter productive. The upper bound on the mass is

$$m_\sigma < \min[m_{\rm en},\, m_{\rm dec}], \tag{16}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} m_{\rm en} &= \frac{A H_{\rm pt} M_{\rm pl}}{H_*}, && (17) \\ m_{\rm dec} &= \max[\frac{H_{\rm pt}}{\lambda^2},\, (M_{\rm pl}^2 H_{\rm pt})^{1/3}]. && (18) \end{aligned}$$

The first bound, $m_\sigma < m_{\rm en}$, is that the energy density in the curvaton should be less than the total energy in the universe at the time of the phase transition, $\Omega_{\rm pt} < 1$ with

$$\Omega_{\rm pt} \equiv \frac{\rho_\sigma}{\rho_{\rm tot}}\Big|_{H=H_{\rm pt}} \sim \left(\frac{m_\sigma \sigma}{H_{\rm pt} M_{\rm pl}}\right)^2 . \tag{19}$$

If the decay rate increases above $\Gamma_\sigma > H_{\rm pt}$ curvaton decay follows immediately; this sets the upper bound on the curvaton mass at the time of decay $m_\sigma < m_{\rm dec}$. The first expression on the right hand side of Eq. (18) corresponds to a coupling constant $\lambda > \lambda_{\rm grav}$, whereas the second expression is for gravitational strength couplings.

The bound on the inflationary scale is minimized for the largest possible curvaton mass. The mass $m_{\rm dec}$ is maximized in the limit $\lambda \to \lambda_{\rm grav}$. Direct decay with $\Omega_{\rm dec} \sim \Omega_{\rm pt} \sim 1$ is only possible if the curvaton dominates the energy density and $m_{\rm dec} \sim m_{\rm en}$. With $H_{\rm osc} \sim \Gamma_\sigma \sim H_*$ and standard scenario values for other parameters the bound on the Hubble scale during inflation is:

$$H_* > A^3 M_{\rm pl} = 2 \times 10^8 \, {\rm GeV}. \tag{20}$$

This can be found using Eq. (6) together with the upper bound on m_σ given by Eq. (16). Alternatively, one can solve $m_{\rm dec} \sim m_{\rm en}$ with $\lambda \to \lambda_{\rm grav}$. For smaller values of the Hubble constant $m_{\rm dec} < m_{\rm en}$ and decay will happen before the curvaton dominates the energy density.

The above expression is valid for $\Omega_{\rm dec} \sim 1$. For smaller values of $\Omega_{\rm dec} < 1$ the mass constraint from energy conservation is relieved $m_{\rm en} \propto \Omega_{\rm dec}^{-1/2}$, while $m_{\rm dec}$ remains unchanged. As a result, $m_{\rm dec} < m_{\rm en}$ and decay occurs when the curvaton density parameter is too small $\Omega_\sigma < \Omega_{\rm dec}$, unless

$$H_* > \frac{A^3 M_{\rm pl}}{\Omega_{\rm dec}^{3/2}}. \tag{21}$$

The bound on the inflationary scale is minimized in the limit $\Omega_{\rm dec} \to 1$, and is given by Eq. (20). Our results differ from Lyth [6], who finds $H_* \gtrsim 10^5$ GeV. The reason is that although Lyth considers energy conservation (he takes $\Omega_{\rm dec} \to 10^{-2}$ to increase $m_{\rm en}$ as much as possible), he does not take into account the constrains from direct decay, i.e., the constraint $m < m_{\rm dec}$.

Low scale inflation is excluded. What is more, this scenario offers no improvement over the standard scenario, while complicating the curvaton potential considerably.

3.2.2 Mass increase after inflation: $H_{\rm pt} \ll H_*$

From Eq. (6) it can be seen that the bound on the Hubble constant can be lowered if

$$H_{\rm osc} = \max[H_{\rm pt}, \, (m_\sigma)_*] \tag{22}$$

is lowered, i.e., if $H_{\rm pt} \ll H_*$. This was noticed in Ref. [9]. Delaying the onset of oscillations means lowering $m_{\rm dec}$, see Eq. (18), which is counter productive. However, the effect on $H_{\rm osc}$ wins, and it is advantageous to lower $H_{\rm osc}$ as much as possible. There is no lower bound on the scale of the phase transition except that it should take place before curvaton decay, which in turn should occur before BBN: $H_{\rm pt} > \Gamma_\sigma > H_{\rm bbn}$.

The bound on the Hubble scale during inflation is minimized in the limit $H_{\rm osc} = H_{\rm pt} \to H_{\rm bbn}$, and direct decay with $\Omega_{\rm dec} \sim \Omega_{\rm pt} \sim 1$. After minimizing the onset of oscillation, the mass $m_{\rm dec}$ should be maximized, which means $\lambda \to \lambda_{\rm grav}$. (In this limit $\lambda_{\rm bbn} = \lambda_{\rm grav}$). Hence, we find just as in the previous subsection that the bound is minimized for $\lambda \sim \lambda_{\rm grav}$ and $m_{\rm en} \sim m_{\rm dec}$. This last requirement is equivalent to demanding the curvaton to decay right after the phase transition while dominating the energy density. In addition, and in contrast with the scenario in which the phase transition takes place promptly at the end of inflation, the bound is further minimized by taking $H_{\rm osc} \to H_{\rm bbn}$. The bound on the Hubble constant then is

$$H_*\Big|_{\Omega_{\rm pt}\sim 1} > \max[\lambda^2 A M_{\rm pl},\, A H_{\rm pt}^{2/3} M_{\rm pl}^{1/3}] > 10^{-14}\,{\rm GeV}. \tag{23}$$

The equation is saturated for direct decay. The first bound is strongest if the coupling $\lambda > \lambda_{\rm grav}$ or $m_\sigma < m_{\rm cr}(\Gamma_\sigma)$, and vice versa for the second bound.

Low scale inflation with $H_* \sim$ TeV is clearly possible. It requires $H_{\rm osc} <$ GeV, and thus $(m_\sigma)_*$, $H_{\rm pt} <$ GeV. If $(m_\sigma)_* > H_{\rm pt}$, and oscillations set in before the phase transition, the bound is raised by a factor $((m_\sigma)_*/H_{\rm pt})$.

If the energy density in the curvaton field after the phase transition is less than the total energy density, $\Omega_{\rm pt} \ll 1$, direct decay will lead to an unacceptable level of non-Gaussianity. A period of curvaton oscillations is required, long enough for the curvaton to dominate at decay. By energy conservation, the curvaton mass is $m_\sigma = \Omega_{\rm pt}^{1/2} m_{\rm en}$, with $m_{\rm en}$ given in Eq. (17). In a radiation dominated universe with $\alpha = 1/2$ the curvaton comes to dominate the energy density at $H_{\rm dom} = \Omega_{\rm pt}^2 H_{\rm pt}$. At that moment $\alpha \to 0$, and there is no further gain in lowering $\Gamma_\sigma < H_{\rm dom}$. The lower bound on the Hubble scale during inflation, see Eq. (6), is $H_* \propto H_{\rm dom}^{1/4}/m_\sigma$ and thus the $\Omega_{\rm pt}$ dependence cancels out. The bound on the Hubble constant for $\Omega_{\rm pt} < 1$ is the same as for direct decay with $\Omega_{\rm pt} = 1$, as long as domination takes place before decay, that is $\Gamma_\sigma < H_{\rm dom} = \Omega_{\rm pt}^2 H_{\rm pt}$. This latter requirement is actually stronger and gives

$$H_* > \max\left[\frac{A M_{\rm pl}\lambda^2}{\Omega_{\rm pt}^{3/2}},\, \frac{A H_{\rm pt}^{2/3} M_{\rm pl}^{1/3}}{\Omega_{\rm pt}^{1/6}}\right] \tag{24}$$

for a coupling $\lambda \geq \lambda_{\rm bbn}, \lambda_{\rm grav}$ and for $\lambda = \lambda_{\rm grav}$ respectively.

Having $\Omega_{\rm pt} < 1$ increases the bound for a gravitational decay rate. The reason is that $\Gamma_{\rm grav} \propto \Omega_{\rm pt}^{3/2} m_{\rm en}^3$, and unless the Hubble constant during inflation is higher than that for direct decay (the value when Eq. (23) is saturated) decay happens before domination. Likewise, for a *fixed coupling constant* $\lambda > \lambda_{\rm grav}$, the bound is minimized for direct decay with $\Omega_{\rm pt} \sim 1$. If $\Omega_{\rm pt} < 1$, then since $\Gamma_\sigma \propto \Omega_{\rm pt}^{1/2} m_{\rm en}$, also here decay will happen before domination unless H_* is raised above the saturation value in Eq. (23). Another way to interpret the bound Eq. (24), however, is that for a *fixed inflationary scale* H_*, the curvaton scenario can equally work for $\Omega_{\rm pt} \sim 1$ and $\lambda^2 < H_*/(AM_{\rm pl})$, as for $\Omega_{\rm pt} < 1$ and a smaller coupling $\lambda^2 < \Omega_{\rm pt}^{3/2} H_*/(AM_{\rm pl})$. In both cases the curvaton dominates before decay. The requirement $\max[H_{\rm bbn}, \Gamma_{\rm grav}] < \Gamma_\sigma < H_{\rm dom}$ reads in terms of the coupling

$$\max\left[\left(\frac{\Omega_{\rm pt}^{1/2} H_{\rm pt} A}{H_*}\right)^2, \frac{H_{\rm bbn} H_*}{\Omega_{\rm pt}^{1/2} A H_{\rm pt} M_{\rm pl}}\right] < \lambda^2 < \frac{\Omega_{\rm pt}^{3/2} H_*}{M_{\rm pl} A}. \tag{25}$$

The minimum bound Eq. (23) is obtained in the limit $H_{\rm BBN} \sim \Gamma_{\rm grav} \sim H_{\rm dom}$, which requires tuning $\Omega_{\rm pt} = 1$ and $\lambda = H_*/(M_{\rm pl} A) = (H_{\rm pt}/M_{\rm pl})^{1/3}$.

Eq. (25) gives a lower bound on $\Omega_{\rm pt}$ for the curvaton scenario to work

$$\Omega_{\rm pt} > \max\left[\left(\frac{H_{\rm bbn}}{H_{\rm pt}}\right)^{1/2}, \left(\frac{M_{\rm pl} H_{\rm pt}^2 A^3}{H_*^3}\right)^2\right]. \tag{26}$$

For low scale inflation $H_* \sim 10^3\,{\rm GeV}$, together with Eq. (24), this gives $\Omega_{\rm pt} > 10^{-12}$.

3.3 Additional ingredients

Above we have shown that low scale inflation is compatible with the curvaton scenario in certain circumstances. But there are obstacles every working model has to face, such as the existence of one or more small masses and late time baryogenesis. Small couplings are needed to avoid thermal evaporation.

A small curvaton mass is needed, $(m_\sigma)_* < 0.1 H_*$ for the stiff inflaton fluid, and $(m_\sigma)_* < 1\,{\rm GeV}$ in the heavy curvaton scenario. This is hard to obtain in the presence of supersymmetry/supergravity, as all scalar fields obtain a soft mass $m \sim m_{3/2}$ from low energy SUSY breaking, and $m \sim H_*$ from SUSY breaking by the finite energy density during inflation. Possible ways out are tuning (slightly in the case of a stiff inflaton fluid but considerably for the heavy curvaton); special, non-minimal Kähler potentials which suppress soft masses [16]; global symmetries (the curvaton as pseudo Nambu Goldstone boson) [17]; giving up on supersymmetry. Soft masses can be small in gauge mediated SUSY breaking schemes, e.g. SUSY breaking at a scale $F \gtrsim (10^5\,{\rm GeV})^2$ yields a gravitino mass $m_{3/2} \gtrsim 10^{-9}\,{\rm GeV}$. However, one can no longer associate the inflaton sector with the SUSY breaking sector, or employ moduli fields to obtain inflation, as this would also imply a very small inflationary scale $H_* \sim F/M_{\rm pl}$.

Baryons and dark matter cannot be created — the epoch of creation being the epoch after which their comoving number density remains constant — when the curvaton contributes still little to the total energy density $\Omega_\sigma \ll 1$, as this would give rise to an unacceptable level of isocurvature perturbations [10, 18]. Creation by the curvaton field is only consistent with an adiabatic perturbation spectrum, if the curvaton is close to dominating the energy density at decay: $\Omega_{\rm dec} > 0.6\,(0.9)$ for baryons (cold dark matter) [3]. There are no constraints if CDM or baryon production takes place after curvaton decay. This is a serious obstacle, especially for small curvaton decay rates and late time phase transitions Γ_σ, $H_{\rm pt} \to H_{\rm bbn}$, as there are no known production mechanisms that work at such a late time.

The stiff inflaton fluid is not affected by thermal effects, as the reheating temperature is low and all couplings involved are small. This is not necessarily the case for the heavy curvaton. Consider a curvaton coupling λ to a standard model (SM) field. The SM field is in thermal equilibrium with the radiation bath if $T > \lambda\sigma$. Evaporation of the curvaton condensate is avoided if the scattering rate is sufficiently small: $\Gamma_\sigma \sim \lambda\alpha_g T < H$ (with α_g a SM structure constant) [19], or

$$H > \lambda^2 \alpha_g^2 M_{\rm pl}. \tag{27}$$

Note that if this equation is satisfied comfortably, even the case of direct decay is compromised, as the thermal bath from curvaton decay will give rise to evaporation before $\Omega_\sigma \sim 1$.

4 The Higgsed curvaton

A straightforward way to implement the heavy curvaton is by introducing a coupling $h^2\phi^2\sigma^2$ in the potential. The field ϕ has zero VEV during inflation, but acquires a large VEV during some phase transition at $H = H_{\rm pt} < H_*$. The effective mass of the curvaton increases suddenly at this phase transition.

4.1 The potential

Consider the following superpotential

$$W = \kappa S(\phi^2 - v^2) + h\sigma(\phi^2 - f^2). \tag{28}$$

We take $v = f$ so that the energy density vanishes in vacuum; this will not influence the results in an essential way. The F-term potential is

$$V = (|\kappa|^2 + |h|^2)|\phi^2 - v^2|^2 + 4|\phi|^2|\kappa S + h\sigma|^2. \tag{29}$$

The potential is of the kind used in hybrid inflation. In analogy we will call S the flaton (flat direction) field, and ϕ the waterfall field. The curvaton is denoted by σ as before.

---

[3] Barring the possibility that baryon production before decay leads to an isocurvature perturbation which is exactly canceled by an isocurvature perturbation from CDM production after decay, or vice versa.

S and σ are massless in the supersymmetric limit. They have small masses induced by Planck suppressed operators and/or soft masses, which we assume are much smaller than the scale of inflation. During inflation S and σ are flat and acquire a large VEV. The field ϕ is heavy due to its coupling with S and remains trapped at the origin. At the end of inflation the field S starts rolling down the potential when $H \sim m_S$. This is the moment of the phase transition, since as S approaches zero the effective ϕ mass becomes negative. The waterfall field rolls down to its minimum $\phi = v$ and the effective curvaton mass increases due to its coupling with ϕ.

The superpotential in Eq. (28) is invariant under a discreet symmetry under which $Q_S = Q_\sigma = 1$ and $Q_\phi = 0$. This symmetry is chosen to avoid superpotential terms of the form

$$W = \lambda_1 S^3 + \lambda_2 \sigma^3 + \lambda_3 \phi^3 + \lambda_4 \sigma^2 \phi + \lambda_5 S^2 \phi. \tag{30}$$

The first two terms give masses to S and σ respectively, and should be very small. Remember that $H_{\rm osc} \sim \max[m_S,\, m_\sigma]$ should be sufficiently small for low scale inflation to be possible. The λ_4 and λ_5 terms lift the flatness of the σ and S direction by quartic couplings. Moreover they lead to terms mixing the masses of σ and S with that of the much heavier field ϕ; these couplings should be sufficiently small to keep the σ and S fields light. Finally, the λ_3 term gives rise to a quartic self interaction for ϕ, which will be important only if $\lambda_3^2 > h^2 + \kappa^2$. This coupling does not need to be anomalous small.

Without loss of generality we can take ϕ and the couplings κ, η real. The only phase left is $\mathrm{Arg}[S\Sigma]$, which only shows up in the term $V \ni 8h\kappa S\sigma\phi^2 + \mathrm{h.c.}$. This term plays no role in the dynamics, it is zero both before the phase transition when $\phi = 0$, and after when $S = 0$. We will henceforth neglect this term. Writing the potential in terms of real fields (denoted by the same symbol), and with the rescalings $\kappa \to \kappa/\sqrt{2}$, $h \to h/\sqrt{2}$, $\eta \to \eta/\sqrt{2}$ and $v \to v/\sqrt{2}$, the relevant part of the potential becomes:

$$V = \frac{\eta^2}{2}(\phi^2 - v^2)^2 + \frac{\kappa}{2}\phi^2 S^2 + \frac{h^2}{2}\phi^2\sigma^2, \tag{31}$$

with $\eta^2 = h^2 + \kappa^2$. The vacuum energy $V_0 \equiv V(\phi = 0) = v^4\eta^2/2$. The effective masses for the curvaton and waterfall field are

$$\begin{aligned} m_\sigma^2 &= (m_\sigma)_*^2 + (hv)^2, & (32)\\ m_\phi^2 &= -(\eta v)^2 + (\kappa S)^2 + (h\sigma)^2, & (33) \end{aligned}$$

The contribution of the $h\sigma$-term to the ϕ-mass is sub-dominant at all times. The curvaton coupling to standard model (SM) particles is not included explicitly in the potential, but is assumed to be suppressed.

We have chosen for a two-field, hybrid inflation type of potential rather than a one-field potential to set off the phase transition, as this offers better perspectives for lowering the bound on H_*. Consider a one-field potential, Eqs. (28, 29) with $\kappa = 0$. Then the ϕ field has to be light, as the phase transition starts at $H \sim m_\phi$, when ϕ starts rolling away from the origin towards its minimum. Consequently, the curvaton mass after the phase transition $m_\sigma = hv = (h/\eta)m_\phi$ remains small, unless h/η is large. But a large h means a large decay rate $\Gamma(\sigma \to \phi)$, leading to early curvaton decay.

Apart from that, a light ϕ-field has other problems. First of all, there is no reason for it to have a small VEV after inflation instead of sitting at its minimum. Secondly, a light field with a negative mass is hard to obtain in SUSY theories. Either, the mass can be driven negative by radiative corrections (but this means large couplings, and hence, a large decay rate), or the mass term is dominated by negative soft contributions (implying a non-minimal Kähler potential in gravity mediated SUSY breaking). Thirdly, the light ϕ field will fluctuate freely during inflation, and $\delta\rho_\phi/\rho_\phi \sim H_*/\phi_*$ — which is large and non-Gaussian for small ϕ_*. Its contribution to the total density perturbations should be negligible small. There are two ways in which ϕ can imprint its perturbations on the CMB. If ρ_ϕ contributes significantly to the total energy density, ϕ acts itself as a curvaton. This contribution to the density perturbations is negligible, less than one percent, if

$$\Omega_\phi \equiv \frac{\rho_\phi}{\rho_{\rm tot}}\Big|_{H=H_{\rm pt}} < 10^{-2}\left(\frac{\phi_*}{\sigma_*}\right) \tag{34}$$

The ratio Ω_ϕ is evaluated at the time of the phase transition, when it has its maximum value (we omit the subscript "pt" to avoid notational clustering). If the field is initially close to the origin $\phi_* \sim \delta\phi_* \sim H_*$, this implies $\Omega_\phi < 10^{-7}$. Further, ϕ can play the rôle of the modulating field in the inhomogeneous reheating scenario [20]. Indeed, both the curvaton mass and decay rate are a function of ϕ. The density perturbations produced in this way are $\delta\rho/\rho \sim \delta\phi/\phi_{\rm dec}$, and are negligible only if the VEV at the time of curvaton decay is sufficiently large, $\phi_{\rm dec} \gg \sigma_*$.

All these constraints and problems are avoided simultaneously by making the ϕ field heavy during inflation. Of course, the density perturbations of the light field S likewise should be suppressed. But this is done much more easily. It requires $\rho_S \ll \sigma_*/S_*$; as there is no constraint on the VEV during inflation one can simply take $S_* \gg \sigma_*$. The curvaton mass and decay rate are independent of S at the time of curvaton decay, and therefore reheating is homogeneous.

4.2 The bound

The model parameters have to satisfy several constraints:

1. If the potential energy density dominates before the phase transition it will drive a period of inflation, hybrid inflation for V_0 dominance and chaotic inflation for S dominance. A long period of inflation should be avoided as this erases all traces of the inflationary period at H_*. This is assured if Ω_ϕ, $\Omega_S < 1$ or $S_* < M_{\rm pl}$ and $v^2\eta < H_{\rm pt}M_{\rm pl}$.

2. The mass of the waterfall field should be positive and large during inflation, so that it is trapped at the origin and does not contribute to the density perturbations: $\kappa S_* > H_*,\ \eta v$. In addition, the density perturbations produced by the flaton field S should be sufficiently small, assured if $\Omega_S < 10^{-2} S_*/\sigma_*$.

3. There can only be an improvement with respect to standard scenario if $m_\sigma = hv \gg (m_\sigma)_*$. This is only possible if the vacuum mass of the waterfall field is much larger than the curvaton mass: $m_\phi/m_\sigma \gg 1$.

4. There is an hierarchy of scales $H_{\rm bbn} < \Gamma_\sigma < H_{\rm pt}$; the curvaton should decay before BBN, but after the phase transition. Γ_σ is the decay rate into SM matter, which should exceed curvaton decay into any of the hidden sector fields, such as ϕ and S. Since $m_\sigma < m_\phi$ after the phase transition, curvaton decay into ϕ quanta is kinematically inaccessible. However, if the fermionic superpartners of ϕ are sufficiently light, the curvaton can still decay into them and $\Gamma_\sigma > h^2 m_\sigma$ is needed.

The parameters $\Omega_{\rm pt}$ and Ω_ϕ, defined in Eqs. (19, 34), give rise to the equalities

$$\rho_\sigma/\Omega_{\rm pt} = \rho_\phi/\Omega_\phi = \rho_{\rm tot} \tag{35}$$

Here $\rho_\phi = V_0$ is the potential energy density stored in the waterfall field before the phase transition, $\rho_\sigma = (m_\sigma \sigma_*)^2$ is the energy density transferred to the curvaton field during the phase transition, and $\rho_{\rm tot} = (H_{\rm pt} M_{\rm pl})^2$ is the total energy density at the time of the phase transition. Further $\Omega_{\rm pt} \leq \Omega_\phi$, saturated when the energy stored in V_0 is transferred entirely to the curvaton field. From the above equation we can solve

$$\begin{aligned} m_\sigma &= \frac{\Omega_{\rm pt}^{1/2} H_{\rm pt} M_{\rm pl}}{\sigma_*} = \left(\frac{\Omega_\phi^{1/2} H_{\rm pt} M_{\rm pl}}{\eta} \right)^{1/2} & (36) \\ \eta &= \frac{\Omega_\phi^{1/2}}{\Omega_{\rm pt}} \frac{(h\sigma_*)^2}{H_{\rm pt} M_{\rm pl}} & (37) \end{aligned}$$

From the first equality in Eq. (36) it seems that direct decay with $\Omega_{\rm pt} \sim \Omega_\phi \to 1$ is possible for all $H_{\rm pt}$, and thus the bound on the Hubble constant during inflation can be $H_* > 10^{-14}\,$GeV, the bound obtained in section 3.2.2. However, this would require couplings exceeding unity. Imposing $h,\ \eta < 1$ together with $\eta = \sqrt{h^2 + \kappa^2} > h$ [4], the bound for direct decay with $\Omega_{\rm pt} \sim 1$ is

$$H_* \Big|_{\Omega_{\rm pt} \sim 1} > \frac{\sqrt{\eta}}{h} A \sqrt{H_{\rm pt} M_{\rm pl}} > 4 \times 10^{-7}\,{\rm GeV}, \tag{38}$$

---

[4] If one considers the potential in Eq. (31) as an effective potential, not coming from a superpotential of the form Eq. (28), then there is no relation between the couplings. One can take the limit $\eta < h$ to try to lower the bound. However, this implies $m_\sigma > m_\phi$ and therefore a large decay rate $\Gamma_\sigma = h^2 m_\sigma$, which is counter productive.

where in the last step we have taken $H_{\rm pt}$, $\Gamma_\sigma \to H_{\rm bbn}$ and $\sqrt{\eta}/h \to 1$. This bound can be either found by using Eqs. (23, 25) with

$$\lambda^2 = \frac{H_*}{AM_{\rm pl}} = \frac{h}{\sqrt{\eta}} \left(\frac{H_{\rm pt}}{M_{\rm pl}}\right)^{1/2}, \tag{39}$$

or from the expression for η in Eq. (37) above. As discussed in section 3.2.2, the bound for $\Omega_{\rm pt} < 1$ is the same as for direct decay with $\Omega_{\rm pt} = 1$, as long as the curvaton density parameter at the end of the phase transition is large enough and the decay rate sufficiently small — see Eqs. (24, 25, 26) — so that curvaton domination occurs before decay, i.e., $\Gamma_\sigma < \Omega_{\rm pt}^2 H_{\rm pt}$.

The bound on the Hubble constant depends on the coupling values. The lower bound above is obtained for $h \sim \kappa \sim 1$ and $\lambda \to \lambda_{\rm bbn} \sim 10^{-11} \gg \lambda_{\rm grav}$. Then low scale inflation with $H_* \sim$ TeV is possible for $(m_\sigma)_*$, $H_{\rm pt} < 10^{-6}\,{\rm GeV}$, $m_\phi < 10^6\,{\rm GeV}$ and $\Omega_{\rm pt} > 10^{-10}$.

It could be argued though, see point (4) above, that the coupling $h \lesssim \lambda$. Taking all couplings approximately equal $h \sim \kappa \sim \lambda \to \lambda_{\rm bbn} \sim 10^{-9}$ gives the bound $H_* > 10^{-2}\,{\rm GeV}$. This is still compatible with low scale inflation, but the amount of tuning is increased. For example, TeV scale inflation is only possible for $(m_\sigma)_*$, $H_{\rm pt} < 5 \times 10^{-15}\,{\rm GeV}$, $m_\phi < 10^{-4}\,{\rm GeV}$ and $\Omega_{\rm pt} > 10^{-6}$. Moreover, these parameter choices violate Eq. (27); the curvaton scenario is jeopardized by thermal evaporation.

If the decay rate into SM matter is of gravitational strength curvaton decay before nucleosynthesis requires $\Omega_{\rm pt}^{1/2} H_{\rm pt} > (H_{\rm bbn}/M_{\rm pl})^{1/3} \sigma_* > 10^{-8}\,{\rm GeV}$ for low scale inflation with $H_* \sim 10^3\,{\rm GeV}$. From Eq. (24) we also get an upper bound on the time of the phase transition $H_{\rm pt} < 10^{-6}/\Omega_{\rm pt}^{1/4}\,{\rm GeV}$. There is only a small window of $H_{\rm pt}$ for which the heavy curvaton scenario can work; in addition $\Omega_{\rm pt} > 10^{-3}$ is needed.

4.3 discussion

Hubble constants much larger than the theoretical, model independent, lower bound $H_* > 10^{-14}\,{\rm GeV}$ are needed in the Higgsed curvaton scenario. The reason is that the parameters are not all independent. Tuning both $\Omega_\phi \to 1$ and $\Omega_{\rm pt}/\Omega_\phi \to 1$ is impossible for coupling constants not exceeding unity.

The model has the same general problems discussed in section 3.3: Late time baryogenesis and at least two small masses. More generically there are three small masses, but with a distinct hierarchy $H_* \gg m_\phi \gg (m_\sigma)_*$, m_S. None of the light fields can be a pseudo Nambu-Goldstone boson (PNGB) as the potential terms $\kappa^2 S^2 \phi^2$ and $h^2 \sigma^2 \phi^2$ break the shift symmetry of all fields.

5 The heavy curvaton as axion

Axions are natural curvaton candidates; the axion mass is protected by a (weakly broken) global symmetry, and therefore can be kept light naturally, even during inflation when supergravity corrections generically lead to masses of the order of the Hubble constant for all scalars.

5.1 Axion with mass from non-renormalizable operators

We consider a potential of the form $V = V_{\rm PQ} + V_{\rm NR}$ with

$$V_{\rm PQ} = \lambda_\Sigma^2 (\Sigma^2 - f^2)^2. \tag{40}$$

The VEV of Σ breaks the PQ-symmetry spontaneously at a scale $\langle \Sigma \rangle = f$. The curvaton σ is identified with the canonically normalized axion field, defined as $\Sigma = (f/\sqrt{2}) \exp(i\sigma/f)$. If the non-renormalizable potential breaks the PQ symmetry explicitly it gives a mass to the axion $m_\sigma \propto f^a$, with a a model dependent constant. Therefore, one way to implement the heavy curvaton is to have an increase in the VEV of Σ at $H_{\rm pt}$ [6]. This can be obtained by a potential term $h\Sigma^2\phi^2$, with $h < 0$. Although negative couplings are possible in SUSY theories, they require very elaborate constructions [23]. We will therefore pursue another option.

Consider the non-renormalizable potential with operators of dimension $D_1 = 2m_1 + n_1$ and $D_2 = 2l_2 + 2m_2 + n_2$ respectively

$$V_{\rm NR} = \lambda_1^2 \left(\frac{|\Sigma|^{2m_1} \Sigma^{n_1}}{M_{\rm pl}^{2m_1+n_1-4}} + \text{c.c.} \right) + \lambda_2^2 \left(\frac{|\phi|^{2l_2} |\Sigma|^{2m_2} \Sigma^{n_2}}{M_{\rm pl}^{2l_2+2m_2+n_2-4}} + \text{c.c.} \right). \tag{41}$$

This potential gives two contributions to the curvaton mass $m_\sigma^2 = m_1^2 + m_2^2$ with

$$\begin{aligned} m_1^2 &= \lambda_1^2 \left(\frac{f}{M_{\rm pl}} \right)^{D_1-2} M_{\rm pl}^2, && (42) \\ m_2^2 &= \lambda_2^2 \left(\frac{f^{D_2-2l_2-2} \phi^{2l_2}}{M_{\rm pl}^{D_2-2}} \right) M_{\rm pl}^2. && (43) \end{aligned}$$

During inflation ϕ has a small VEV and $(m_\sigma)_* = m_1$. After inflation there is a phase transition in which the VEV of ϕ grows to large values and $m_\sigma \approx m_2$. The bound on the inflationary scale can be weakened only if $m_2 > m_1$ or

$$\left(\frac{\phi}{f} \right)^{2l_2} > \left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2} \right)^2 \left(\frac{f}{M_{\rm pl}} \right)^{D_1-D_2}. \tag{44}$$

For operators of the same dimension $D_1 = D_2$ and couplings $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$ this is just the requirement that $\phi > f$.

In the following we will assume that the initial curvaton VEV is of the order of its maximal value $\sigma_* \sim f$; this assumption minimizes the bound on H_*. Curvaton decay into SM matter is mediated by non-renormalizable operators, so that the PQ symmetry is preserved at the normalizable level. The decay rate then is of gravitational strength and the bound is given by Eq. (24)

$$H_* > \frac{A M_{\rm pl}^{1/3} H_{\rm pt}^{2/3}}{\Omega_{\rm pt}^{1/6}}. \tag{45}$$

Direct decay corresponds to the limit $\Omega_{\rm pt} \to 1$ and $f \to \sigma_*$. The value of $H_{\rm pt}$ cannot be lowered/raised arbitrarily in this model. First of all $H_{\rm pt} > m_1$, otherwise the bound is increased by a factor $(m_1/H_{\rm pt})$. Further $m_2 \propto H_{\rm pt}$, and thus so is the decay rate; $H_{\rm pt}$ should be large enough for decay to take place before BBN. Lastly $m_\phi \geq H_{\rm pt}$. This together constrains

$$\max\left[\lambda_1 \left(\frac{f}{M_{\rm pl}}\right)^{\frac{D_1-2}{2}} M_{\rm pl},\ \frac{f}{\sqrt{\Omega_{\rm pt}}}\left(\frac{H_{\rm bbn}}{M_{\rm pl}}\right)^{1/3}\right] < H_{\rm pt} < m_\phi. \tag{46}$$

If $D_1 \geq 9$ the limit $H_{\rm pt} \to H_{\rm bbn}$ is possible and direct decay with $\Omega_{\rm pt} = \Omega_\phi \to 1$ gives the theoretical lower bound $H_* > 10^{-14}\,{\rm GeV}$ of section 3.2.2. However, we still have to add the explicit form of the potential V_ϕ that is to trigger the phase transition. And as for the Higgsed curvaton, we expect that this will give additional constraints on the system. We will discuss two cases below focusing on the possibility of low scale inflation with $H_* \sim 10^3\,{\rm GeV}$. Note that independently of the potential, the lower bound on $\Omega_{\rm pt}$ from combining Eqs. (45, 46) is

$$\Omega_{\rm pt} > 10^{-12}\left(\frac{H_*}{10^3{\rm GeV}}\right)^{-2/3}. \tag{47}$$

5.1.1 V_ϕ quadratic

To achieve the phase transition we add a quadratic potential for ϕ

$$V_\phi = -m_\phi^2 \phi^2. \tag{48}$$

The phase transition takes place at $H_{\rm pt} \sim m_\phi$ when the field starts rolling towards large VEVs until the potential is lifted by the terms in $V_{\rm NR}$. The ϕ-field is necessarily light; its contribution to the density perturbations is negligible small if Eq. (34) is satisfied.

Assume that at large ϕ the dominant term in $V_{\rm NR}$ has $l_2 > 2$, so that the potential increases faster than quadratically and there is no runaway behavior, as well as $n_2 \geq 2$ so that it generates a mass term for the curvaton. This is the most advantageous situation for the heavy curvaton, since then all of the potential energy is transferred to the curvaton field and $\Omega_{\rm pt} = \Omega_\phi$, with $\Omega_{\rm pt}$, Ω_ϕ defined in

Eqs. (19, 34). This gives the relation $m_2 f \sim m_\phi \phi = \sqrt{\Omega_{\rm pt}} H_{\rm pt} M_{\rm pl}$, which can be solved for $\Omega_{\rm pt}$:

$$\Omega_{\rm pt} \sim \left(\frac{H_{\rm pt}}{\lambda_2 M_{\rm pl}}\right)^{\frac{2}{l_2-1}} \left(\frac{M_{\rm pl}}{f}\right)^{\frac{D_2-2l_2}{l_2-1}} . \tag{49}$$

Eqs. (45, 46) put an upper/lower bound on $H_{\rm pt}$, and therefore likewise on $\Omega_{\rm pt}$. Taking $\lambda_2 \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$ we get

$$\left(\frac{M_{\rm pl}}{f}\right)^{\frac{D_2-2l_2-2}{l_2}} \left(\frac{H_{\rm bbn}}{M_{\rm pl}}\right)^{\frac{2}{3l_2}} < \Omega_{\rm pt} < \left(\frac{M_{\rm pl}}{f}\right)^{\frac{2(D_2-2l_2-3)}{2l_2-3}} . \tag{50}$$

In Table 1 below the values of $\Omega_{\rm pt}$ are tabulated for various values of D_2 and l_2 for the case of low scale inflation with $H_* \sim$ TeV and $f \sim \sigma_* = H_*/A$.

$(D_2,\, l_2)$	$(\Omega_{\rm pt})_{\rm min}$	$(\Omega_{\rm pt})_{\rm max}$	δD
(6, 2)	–	–	–
(7, 2)	6×10^{-9}	1	2
(8, 2)	6×10^{-3}	1	18
(8, 3)	9×10^{-9}	3×10^{-10}	2
(9, 2)	–	–	–
(9, 3)	3×10^{-6}	1	6
(10, 2)	–	–	–
(10, 3)	3×10^{-2}	1	40
(10, 4)	7×10^{-8}	1×10^{-5}	4

Table 1

The heavy curvaton cannot work for $(D_2,\, l_2) = (6,2), (9,2), (10,2)$ as these operators cannot give $\Omega_{\rm pt} > 10^{-12}$, see Eq. (47). A low value $\Omega_{\rm pt} < 10^{-7}$, in order to suppress the ϕ contribution to the density perturbations, is only possible for $(D_2,\, l_2) = (7,2)$, $(8,3)$ and $(10,4)$. The mass $(m_\sigma)_* = m_1 < (H_{\rm pt})_{\rm min}$ for all $D_1 \geq 7$, in agreement with Eq. (46).

The dominant contribution to the curvaton mass is provided by a dimension D_2 operator with $l_2 \geq 2$. In addition there might be operators in $V_{\rm NR}$ which are pure monomials in ϕ (terms with $D_2 = 2l_2$ in the language of Eq. (41)); call the dimension of the lowest order such operator D_ϕ. If this latter term dominates the potential at large ϕ, then only part of the potential energy stored in ϕ is transferred to curvaton energy during the phase transition and $\Omega_{\rm pt} < \Omega_\phi$. For $D_\phi = D_2$ the ϕ monomial always dominates. In this case $\Omega_{\rm pt} = \Omega_\phi^2 V_{D_2}/V_{D_\phi} \ll 10^{-12}$ for all values of $(D_2,\, l_2)$; the heavy curvaton scenario does not work, as follows from Eq. (47). The ϕ-monomial is sub-dominant, and the curvaton scenario works as before, if $D_\phi = D_2 + \delta D$ with $\delta D \geq 2$. The values of δD for the different combinations of $(D_2,\, l_2)$ are given in Table 1 above.

The favored operators, those with a low value of δD, are the same operators that give a low value of $\Omega_{\rm pt}$. Not surprisingly, these are the operators with the largest value of l_2, maximizing the mass increase (m_2/m_1).

5.1.2 V_ϕ quartic

In this subsection we take the potential responsible for the phase transition to be quartic, of the form

$$V_\phi = -m_\phi^2 \phi^2 + \eta^2 \phi^4. \tag{51}$$

If this is all, and $H_{\rm pt} \sim m_\phi$ as in the previous subsection, there is no gain in introducing the quartic term as it can only be harmful and lead to $\Omega_{\rm pt} < \Omega_\phi$. So we assume that the potential is embedded in a hybrid inflation type of potential of the form Eq. (31). If this potential originates from the superpotential in Eq. (28), then the quartic coupling is restricted: $\eta > H_*/S_* > 10^{-15}$ for $H_* \sim$ TeV, see point (2) in section 4.2. In this set up it is possible to have $m_\phi > H_{\rm pt}$, which gives more freedom in model building. Further, the ϕ-field is now heavy during inflation and does not fluctuate; consequently the upper bound on $\Omega_{\rm pt}$ of Eq. (34) does not apply.

For large coupling $\eta > 10^{-6(D_2-4)}$, the potential is lifted by the quartic term at large ϕ and not by the operators in $V_{\rm NR}$, and the VEV is $\phi = m_\phi/\eta$. We can solve for $\Omega_{\rm pt} = V_{\rm NR}/(H_{\rm pt} M_{\rm pl})^2$, giving

$$\Omega_{\rm pt} = \lambda_2^2 \left(\frac{H_{\rm pt}}{M_{\rm pl}}\right)^{2(l_2-1)} \left(\frac{f}{M_{\rm pl}}\right)^{D_2-2l_2} \left(\frac{m_\phi}{H_{\rm pt}\eta}\right)^{2l_2}. \tag{52}$$

Using the upper/lower bound on the scale of the phase transition, see Eqs. (45, 46), we again get an upper/lower bound on $\Omega_{\rm pt}$:

$$\left(\frac{f}{M_{\rm pl}}\right)^{\frac{D_2-2}{l_2}} \left(\frac{H_{\rm bbn}}{M_{\rm pl}}\right)^{\frac{2(l_2-1)}{3l_2}} \left(\frac{m_\phi}{H_{\rm pt}\eta}\right)^{2} < \Omega_{\rm pt} < \left(\frac{f}{M_{\rm pl}}\right)^{\frac{2(D_2+l_2-3)}{3-l_2}} \left(\frac{m_\phi}{H_{\rm pt}\eta}\right)^{\frac{4l_2}{3-l_2}} \tag{53}$$

The lower bound is generically small $(\Omega_{\rm pt})_{\rm min} \ll 1$, and can easily be satisfied. The whole issue is whether the upper bound can be large enough, $\Omega_{\rm pt} > 10^{-12}$ for TeV scale inflation. The upper bound is maximized in the limit of small $H_{\rm pt}$ (or equivalently $\Gamma_\sigma \to H_{\rm bbn}$) and η. The ϕ mass is related to the scale of the phase transition by the relation $m_\phi^2/\eta = \Omega_\phi^{1/2} H_{\rm pt} M_{\rm pl}$.

In Table 2 below we have indicated the values of (D_2, l_2) for which $\Omega_{\rm pt} \sim 1$ is possible. Large $\Omega_{\rm pt}$ is not possible for $l_2 = 1$, independent of the value of D_2, so we left that option out.

$(D_2,\, l_2)$	$\Omega_{\rm pt} \sim 1$	β_0
(6, 2)	$\surd$	$10^{-8} - 10^{-10}$
(7, 2)	$\surd$	$10^{5} - 10^{-6}$
(8, 2)	–	–
(8, 3)	$\surd$	10^{-9}
(9, 2)	–	–
(9, 3)	$\surd$	10^{-5}
(10, 2)	–	–
(10, 3)	$\surd$	10^{-8}
(10, 4)	$\surd$	$< 10^{-8}$

Table 2

Also listed is the boundary value of $\beta = (m_\phi/H_{\rm pt}\eta)/(m_\phi/H_{\rm pt}\eta)_{\rm max}$ for which the curvaton scenario can work. Here

$$\left(\frac{m_\phi}{H_{\rm pt}\eta}\right)_{\rm max} = \begin{cases} 1 \times 10^{19} \left(\frac{\Omega_{\rm pt}\Omega_\phi}{1}\right)^{1/4} \left(\frac{10^{-12}}{\eta}\right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{H_{\rm bbn}}{\Gamma_\sigma}\right)^{1/6}, & D_2 = 6, \\ 4 \times 10^{20} \left(\frac{\Omega_{\rm pt}\Omega_\phi}{1}\right)^{1/4} \left(\frac{10^{-15}}{\eta}\right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{H_{\rm bbn}}{\Gamma_\sigma}\right)^{1/6}, & D_2 > 6. \end{cases} \tag{54}$$

For $D_2 = 6$ the quartic coupling has to be $\eta > 10^{-12}$ for the quartic term to dominate over $V_{\rm NR}$, whereas for $D_2 > 6$ the dominant constraint is $\eta > 10^{-15}$ from the requirement that ϕ is heavy during inflation.

For $l_2 = 2,\, 3$ the curvaton scenario can work for $\beta_0 < \beta < 1$, with β_0 the value listed in Table 2. The smaller β_0 the larger the parameter space, as there is more room for η, $\Omega_{\rm pt}$, Ω_ϕ and/or Γ_σ to vary. For $l_2 = 2$ the exact value of β_0 depends on $\Omega_{\rm pt}$, and there is a β_0-range: the upper bound corresponds to $\Omega_{\rm pt} \sim 1$, whereas the lower bound is for $\Omega_{\rm pt} = \beta$. Note that the upper bound on the curvaton density parameter after the phase transition is $\Omega_{\rm pt} > \beta_0$.

For $l_2 \geq 4$ the upper bound on $\Omega_{\rm pt}$ is maximized for large η and Γ_σ, as follows from Eq. (53). The value of β_0 in this case is an *upper* bound. For example, for $(D_2,\, l_2) = (10,\, 4)$ one needs $\beta < 10^{-8}$. In this case couplings $\eta \sim 1$ are possible. The lower bound on $\Omega_{\rm pt}$ of Eq. (47) can be reached.

Non-renormalizable terms with $D_\phi = 2l_2$ are negligible small, and therefore do not alter the above picture, if $\eta > \lambda_\phi(\phi/M_{\rm pl})^{(D_\phi-4)/2}$ or

$$\eta > \lambda_\phi \left(\frac{\Omega_\phi^{1/2} H_{\rm pt}}{M_{\rm pl}}\right)^{\frac{D_\phi-4}{D_\phi}} > (10^{-26})^{\frac{D_\phi-4}{D_\phi}}, \tag{55}$$

where in the last step we have taken $\lambda_\phi \sim 1$, $\Omega_{\rm pt} \to \Omega_\phi$ and $H_{\rm pt} \to 10^{-8}\Omega_{\rm pt}^{-1/2}$ (which is the lower bound of Eq. (46)). The non-renormalizable potential is negligible for $\eta > 10^{-9}, 10^{-13}, 10^{-16}$ for $D_\phi = 6,\, 8,\, 10$. Even for $D_\phi = D_2$, only part of parameter space is excluded. This is in sharp contrast with the quadratic model discussed in the previous subsection, where $D_\phi - D_2 \geq 2$ is needed.

5.2 discussion

The main difference between the Higgsed curvaton and the axionic curvaton is that the latter obtains its mass from non-renormalizable operators instead of through a direct coupling. The advantage is that the curvaton can be kept light naturally. Moreover, since the $\phi\sigma$-coupling is of gravitational strength, there is no strong constraint from curvaton decay into ϕ or its superpartners. But the use of non-renormalizable operators also has it draw backs. There is less freedom in tuning couplings. In particular, the curvaton decay rate is of gravitational strength, which constrains the model considerably. Further, it is harder to suppress or forbid unwanted operators, as discrete symmetries might be broken by gravity — indeed, the non-renormalizable potential violates the PQ symmetry explicitly. This is especially a problem for the quadratic potential of section 5.2.1.

6 Conclusions

We revisited the bound on the Hubble scale during inflation in the context of the curvaton scenario. The bound can be weakened in non-standard settings. One specific example is the heavy curvaton scenario. In this scenario the curvaton mass increases significantly after the end of inflation, (possibly) triggered by a phase transition. We reanalyzed the bound in this set up, exhibiting explicitly the dependence on various parameters. We take into account the upper bound on the curvaton mass coming from both energy conservation and direct decay. A lower bound on the Hubble constant of $H_* > 10^{-14}\,\mathrm{GeV}$ is obtained, in the limit that the mass increase happens just before nucleosynthesis. TeV scale inflation requires $H_{\rm pt} < 1\,\mathrm{GeV}$.

We discussed two implementations of the heavy curvaton in detail. The Higgsed curvaton receives a mass through a Higgs mechanism, whereas the axionic curvaton receives its mass from non-renormalizable operators. Although in theory a Hubble constant $H_* \to 10^{-14}\,\mathrm{GeV}$ is possible, it turns out that even obtaining TeV scale inflation is hard to achieve. The reason is that in these explicit models the various parameters cannot all be varied independently.

Acknowledgments

The author is supported by the European Union under the RTN contract HPRN-CT-2000-00152 Supersymmetry in the Early Universe.

References

[1] K. Enqvist and M. S. Sloth, Nucl. Phys. B **626**, 395 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0109214]; D. H. Lyth and D. Wands, Phys. Lett. B **524**, 5 (2002),

[arXiv:hep-ph/0110002]; T. Moroi and T. Takahashi, Phys. Lett. B **522**, 215 (2001) [Erratum-ibid. B **539**, 303 (2002)] [arXiv:hep-ph/0110096].

[2] K. Dimopoulos and D. H. Lyth, arXiv:hep-ph/0209180.

[3] P. Binetruy and M. K. Gaillard, Phys. Rev. D **34** (1986) 3069; K. Kadota and E. D. Stewart, JHEP **0307** (2003) 013; L. Randall, M. Soljacic and A. H. Guth, Nucl. Phys. B **472** (1996) 377; E. D. Stewart, Phys. Lett. B **391** (1997) 34; E. D. Stewart, Phys. Rev. D **56** (1997) 2019; M. Dine and A. Riotto, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79** (1997) 2632; M. Bastero-Gil and S. F. King, Phys. Lett. B **423** (1998) 27; M. Bastero-Gil, V. Di Clemente and S. F. King, arXiv:hep-ph/0211011; M. Bastero-Gil, V. Di Clemente and S. F. King, arXiv:hep-ph/0211012.

[4] G. Dvali and S. Kachru, arXiv:hep-th/0309095;

[5] N. Kaloper, Phys. Lett. B **583**, 1 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0312002].

[6] D. H. Lyth, arXiv:hep-th/0308110.

[7] M. Postma, arXiv:astro-ph/0311563.

[8] M. Giovannini, arXiv:hep-ph/0310024.

[9] T. Matsuda, Class. Quant. Grav. **21**, L11 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0312058].

[10] D. H. Lyth, C. Ungarelli and D. Wands, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 023503 (2003) [arXiv:astro-ph/0208055].

[11] D. N. Spergel *et al.*, Astrophys. J. Suppl. **148**, 175 (2003) [arXiv:astro-ph/0302209].

[12] K. Dimopoulos, G. Lazarides, D. Lyth and R. Ruiz de Austri, arXiv:hep-ph/0308015. K. Enqvist, A. Mazumdar and M. Postma, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 121303 (2003) [arXiv:astro-ph/0304187]. M. Postma, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 063518 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0212005].

[13] A. Kusenko and M. E. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Lett. B **418**, 46 (1998) [arXiv:hep-ph/9709492].

[14] P. J. E. Peebles and A. Vilenkin, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 063505 (1999) [arXiv:astro-ph/9810509].

[15] M. Giovannini, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 123512 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0301264].

[16] M. K. Gaillard, H. Murayama and K. A. Olive, Phys. Lett. B **355**, 71 (1995), [arXiv:hep-ph/9504307].

[17] K. Dimopoulos, D. H. Lyth, A. Notari and A. Riotto, JHEP **0307**, 053 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0304050].

[18] C. Gordon and A. Lewis, New Astron. Rev. **47**, 793 (2003).

[19] A. Anisimov and M. Dine, Nucl. Phys. B **619**, 729 (2001), [arXiv:hep-ph/0008058]; R. Allahverdi, B. A. Campbell and J. R. Ellis, Nucl. Phys. B **579**, 355 (2000), [arXiv:hep-ph/0001122].

[20] G. Dvali, A. Gruzinov and M. Zaldarriaga, arXiv:astro-ph/0303591; L. Kofman, arXiv:astro-ph/0303614.

[21] R. D. Peccei and H. R. Quinn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **38**, 1440 (1977).

[22] M. S. Turner, Phys. Rept. **197**, 67 (1990).

[23] E. D. Stewart, Phys. Lett. B **345**, 414 (1995) [arXiv:astro-ph/9407040].